REMARKS

Claim 32 has been added, and therefore claims 1 to 32 are pending.

In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to paragraph seven (7) of the Final Office Action, claims 1 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as to the enablement requirement.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, independent claims 1, 6 and 10 have been rewritten (the wherein clause that was questioned has been deleted) so as to obviate the enablement rejections, so that claims 1, 6 and 10 as presented are enabled, as are their respective dependent claims. No new matter has been added and the claims as written are supported by the present application, including the specification. It is therefore respectfully requested that the enablement rejections be withdrawn, since claims 1 to 31 are allowable.

With respect to paragraph eleven (11) of the Final Office Action, claims 1 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, independent claims 1, 6 and 10 have been rewritten (the wherein clause that was questioned has been deleted) so as to obviate the indefiniteness rejections, so that claims 1, 6 and 10 as presented are definite, as are their respective dependent claims. No new matter has been added and the claims as written are supported by the present application, including the specification. It is therefore respectfully requested that the definiteness rejections be withdrawn, since claims 1 to 31 are allowable.

With respect to paragraph eighteen (18) of the Final Office Action, claims 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 to 14, and 16 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,489,414 to Titherley ("Titherley"). The rejections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

To anticipate a claim under § 102(b), a single prior art reference must identically disclose each and every claim feature M.P.E.P. § 2131. Claim 1 is to a method for controlling a run of a *program* executable on at least one *microprocessor* of *a microcontroller*, including the steps of: reading in *information regarding a hardware of the microcontroller* from at least one *information register* of the microcontroller; and *actuating* at least one *switch* via which the program run is *controlled* as a function of the information read in.

While the anticipation rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 1 as presented also now provides that *program execution only depends on information in the at least one information register of the microcontroller, which is special for each microcontroller step without other external or operator related influences.*

In contrast, in the "Titherley" reference, the program flow is controlled by the operator using switches S1 to S5, which is wholly unlike the subject matter of claim 1 as presented in which *program execution only depends on information in the at least one information register of the microcontroller, which is special for each microcontroller step without other external or operator related influences.*

In the context of the presently claimed subject matter, a program is used which is usable for more than one microcontroller step, which is a different variant concerning hardware implementation of a microcontroller. So what is avoided in the context of the presently claimed subject matter is to have different programs for different microcontroller steps, since every program for each step has to be serviced and updated. Accordingly, one program is used for different microcontroller steps.

The problem to be solved is then that the program can not be used as it is, but has to be switched with regard to the different hardware of the different microcontroller steps, so that not every program part is executed, but only the right program parts are executed, connected to each microcontroller step. This also means that workarounds are implemented, if a special kind of hardware or port or whatever should not be addressed in one microcontroller step, but should be addressed in another microcontroller step. So with the aid of the hardware-given switches which are information implemented in the respective microcontroller step (e.g., in an information register), program sequences for specific features of each microcontroller step or for specific workarounds, can be activated or deactivated. These aspects concerning the different microcontroller steps are not identically disclosed or in any way suggested in the applied references.

So in the , the program execution is only depending on the information in the information register of the microcontroller, which is special for each microcontroller step without other, especial external or operator related influences.

The "Titherley" reference only indicates that the information is provided over a display and inputted by a keyboard during operation so that the program execution is depending on operator input, especially over switches S1 to S5. The "Titherley" reference

does not identically disclose or even suggest an information register and different microcontroller steps, as provided for in the context of claim 1 as presented.

In particular, the "Titherley" reference does not identically disclose or in any way suggest the feature in which *program execution only depends on information in the at least one information register of the microcontroller, which is special for each microcontroller step without other external or operator related influences.*

The "Titherley" reference therefore does not anticipate the subject matter of claims 1, 6 and 10, as presented, or their respective dependent claims. Therefore claims 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 to 14 and 16 to 22 are allowable.

With respect to paragraph forty-five (45) of the Final Office Action, claims 5, 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over "Titherley" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,203 to Simar Jr. et al. ("Simar").

Claims 5, 9 and 14 respectively depend from claims 1, 6 and 10, as presented, and are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claims 1, 6 and 10 as presented, since the secondary reference does not cure the critical deficiencies of the primary reference.

New claim 32 does not add any new matter and is supported by the present application, including the specification. Claim 32 includes features like those of claim 1, as presented, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1 as presented.

Accordingly, claims 1 to 32 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims 1 to 32 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, since they have been obviated. Since all issues raised have been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/1/2006

By: _____
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

1227071

11